



# Fifth Program Year CAPER

The CPMP Fifth Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report includes Narrative Responses to CAPER questions that CDBG, HOME, HOPWA, and ESG grantees must respond to each year in order to be compliant with the Consolidated Planning Regulations. The Executive Summary narratives are optional.

The grantee must submit an updated Financial Summary Report (PR26).

## GENERAL

### Executive Summary

This module is optional but encouraged. If you choose to complete it, provide a brief overview that includes major initiatives and highlights that were proposed and executed throughout the first year.

Program Year 5 CAPER Executive Summary response:

Program Year 2012 was the fifth year of the five year (2008-2012) Consolidated Plan. To establish the goals and objectives of the five-year Consolidated Plan and the one year Action Plans, input was gathered from citizens, non-profit entities, City Departments, City Boards and Commissions and Committees through public meetings. The process ensured full access and participation by the community in developing goals and objectives by reviewing any public input on the eligible areas, prioritizing problems and solutions, and developing a good strategic plan.

The Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER) is a report that provides information on Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) activities undertaken by the City of Rogers from January 1, 2012 to December 31, 2012. Funds for these activities are provided by the U. S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) through the Community Development Block Grant Entitlement Cities Program.

The City of Rogers is aware of the need of the many and various community development activities, both housing and non-housing needs, including public improvements. The City acknowledges that there are not enough funds available to meet all of the City's needs and funding limitations did not allow all requests for funding to be addressed in 2012. The City will endeavor to identify these needs and requests for possible funding in subsequent years as CDBG funds become available. The City is also mindful of continuing to carry out the Community Development Block Grant Program for maximum benefit to extremely-low to low-income individuals and families.

The Community Development Block Grant Program continues to partner with the City and other agencies to accomplish their short and long term goals and at the same time met the goals set by the U. S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. The goals of the City of Rogers' CDBG Program are to provide:

(a) Decent Housing to include assisting homeless persons to obtain appropriate housing, assisting persons at risk of becoming homeless; retaining the attainable housing stock; and increasing the availability of permanent housing in standard condition and at an affordable cost for low-to-moderate-income families, particularly to members of disadvantaged minorities, without discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, national origin, family status, or disability. Decent housing also includes increasing the supply of supportive housing, which combines structural features and services needed to enable persons with special needs, including persons with HIV/AIDS and their families, to live with dignity and independence; and providing affordable housing to low-income persons that is accessible to job opportunities.

(b) A Suitable Living Environment includes improving the safety and livability of neighborhoods; increasing access to quality public and private facilities and services, reducing the isolation of income groups within a community or geographical area through the spatial de-concentration of housing opportunities for persons of low income and the revitalization of deteriorating or deteriorated neighborhoods; restoring and preserving properties of special historic, architectural, or aesthetic value; and conserving energy resources.

(c) Expanded Economic Opportunities includes job creation and retention; establishment, stabilization and expansion of small business (including micro-businesses); provision of public services and concerned with employment, provision of jobs to low-income persons living in areas affected by those programs and activities, or jobs resulting from carrying out activities under programs covered by the plan; availability of mortgage financing for low-income persons at reasonable rates using non-discriminatory lending practices; access to capital and credit for development activities that promote the long-term economic and social viability of the community; and empowerment and self-sufficiency for low-income persons to reduce generational poverty in Federally assisted housing and public housing.

The City of Rogers received \$400,866 in Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds from the U. S. Department of Housing and Urban Development from January 1, 2012 and ending December 31, 2012. These funds were used for one housing service project that did five rehabilitation activities with one rehab activity starting in 2011 and completing in 2012, five public service projects, and three public facility projects. One of the facility projects included a previous year project funded with 2011 funds that was completed in 2011 and final CDBG reimbursement made in 2012. All these projects improved the living conditions for the City's low and moderate income residents. During Program Year 2012, the city of Rogers spent its CDBG funds in the following areas:

- \$90,965.50 was spent on housing rehabilitation, emergency repairs, and weatherization projects. Five houses were recipients of this funding touching the lives of 18 individuals.
- \$12,162.00 was spent providing transportation assistance to the City's low income elderly and disabled citizens. Sixty-nine people were recipients of this program.
- \$26,320.00 was spent providing after school and summer care for low income children. During the second semester and summer session of 2012, 261 people were impacted by this public service activity.

- \$5,000.00 was spent providing funding for volunteer child advocacy to Rogers children who have been removed from their homes for various reasons and are now living in foster homes or children's shelters. There were a total of 24 people impacted by this activity funding.

- \$5,000.00 was spent providing dental supplies needed for pediatric dental services to low income children in Rogers. The Community Clinic provided dental services to 1,484 low income children in Rogers during the 2012 Program Year.

- \$1,093.91 was spent paying utility bills for low income individuals and families who could not pay their bills due to extenuating circumstances. Fifteen people received this service in Program Year 2012.

- \$3,650.00 was spent to provide a retaining wall at a transitional housing complex for low-income adults with severe and persistent mental illness. Retaining wall was needed to stop erosion and assist with drainage problems in this area. The City also used \$1,350.00 of their street funds to provide a pipe in the street right of way to make sure this water could be moved off the street. Eight people were served by this activity in Program Year 2012.

- \$73,151.00 was spent on the final installment for infrastructure costs to the new Open Avenues Building which serves adults living with emotional, mental and physical limitations. In Program Year 2012, 115 were provided a sheltered workshop where they learned new skills, built close relationships, and provided business and industry with a reliable off-line production workforce.

- \$194,277.68 was spent on Persimmon Street project which started in 2011 and completed in 2012. This project built Persimmon to City street standards and provided curb, gutter and sidewalks. The project impacted 3,200 people who use this street to maneuver through the City of Rogers.

- \$1,350.00 was spent to provide drainage work at the Oak Tree Apartments in conjunction with a grant provided to the complex for a retaining wall. These funds were used to provide pipe in the street right of way to make sure water being blocked by the retaining wall would not end up in the street. Eight people were served by this activity in Program Year 2012.

## General Questions

1. Assessment of the one-year goals and objectives:
  - a. Describe the accomplishments in attaining the goals and objectives for the reporting period.
  - b. Provide a breakdown of the CPD formula grant funds spent on grant activities for each goal and objective.
  - c. If applicable, explain why progress was not made towards meeting the goals and objectives.
2. Describe the manner in which the recipient would change its program as a result of its experiences.
3. Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing:
  - a. Provide a summary of impediments to fair housing choice.

- b. Identify actions taken to overcome effects of impediments identified.
- 4. Describe Other Actions in Strategic Plan or Action Plan taken to address obstacles to meeting underserved needs.
- 5. Leveraging Resources
  - a. Identify progress in obtaining "other" public and private resources to address needs.
  - b. How Federal resources from HUD leveraged other public and private resources.
  - c. How matching requirements were satisfied.

Program Year 5 CAPER General Questions response:

1. **Assessment of the One-Year Goals and Objectives:**

Communities develop their own programs and funding priorities based on local needs. HUD has established guidelines to define the types of projects/activities that may be undertaken and to ensure each project/activity meets one of the national objectives of the CDBG Program. Examples of eligible projects/activities include:

- (a) Acquisition and disposition of real property.
- (b) Acquisition, construction, reconstruction and rehabilitation of public facilities such as community, senior and health centers. Public facilities also include streets, sidewalks, parks, playgrounds, and infrastructure (water and sewer or flood and drainage improvements).
- (c) Provisions of public services such as child care, health care, recreation or education programs, services for senior citizens, and services for homeless persons.
- (d) Residential housing rehabilitation.

Each project/activity must carry out one of the three national objectives of the program:

(a) Benefit low and moderate income persons either individually, such as housing rehabilitation, or area-wide, such as improvements to streets, sidewalks, and parks. Activities that benefit special populations that are presumed to be low and moderate income such as elderly persons, abused spouses or children, homeless persons, and developmentally or physically handicap persons.

(b) Aid in the prevention or elimination of slums and blight on an area basis, spot basis, or in an urban renewal area.

(c) Meet urgent community development needs that pose a serious and immediate threat to the health or welfare of the community.

a. **Describe the accomplishments in Attaining the Goals and Objectives for the Reporting Period.**

Listed below are the objectives, goals, and accomplishments for the City of Rogers' 2012 Program Year:

### **Housing \$90,965.50 – 20% of the Grant Funds Spent in 2012**

The City has taken steps to encourage affordable housing by passing zoning ordinances which encourage affordable development by reducing setback requirements and density. This has sparked an interest from developers to look at building affordable housing in Rogers especially since the City has seen a slow down in the building of high-end market housing. The City saw an increase of 591 building permits from 2011 to 2012. One item that stuck out was single family housing. Housing rehabilitation continues to be a focus for using CDBG grant money to meet. Permits showed an increase of 128 from 2011 to 2012. The area's economy and unemployment rate are much better than the national or state average.

Housing rehabilitation continues to be a focus for using CDBG grant money to meet the City's housing goals and objectives. In the first year of the City's Five Year Consolidated Plan, the City partnered with other agencies to meet most of our housing rehabilitation goals. In year two, the City began using the City's Building and Inspections Department to assist the CDBG Office in inspecting applicant's homes as well as assisting in preparing specifications for bids. The CDBG Office began processing applications to qualify recipients and in working with other City Departments, we basically oversee rehabilitation from start to finish. The City feels this is working very well and has given the City a much better control of spending our CDBG funds. We will work with the non-profits when certain needs arise. Five houses received rehabilitation through CDBG funding in 2012.

#### **Housing Rehabilitation and Emergency Repair**

Goal: Decent Housing

Objective: Benefit low and moderate income persons by improving the quality of owner housing which will increase the availability of permanent housing in standard condition at an affordable cost and retain attainable housing stock.

The City undertook five housing rehabilitation projects in 2012. One of the five started in late 2011 and completed in 2012. All homeowners were low income and unable to financially pay for the work. Home No. 1 is owned by a single mom with three children. This was the home started in 2011 and completed this year. The only work done in 2011 was to install a new roof. In 2012, the City replaced windows, back door, old heating unit with new HVAC, repaired leak damage, adding an electrical "J" box to get the house to code, and repaired some structural damage by adding a hidden beam in living room from wall to floor to help carry the load. Home No. 2 was owned by a single disabled woman who shared her home with her mother due to some complications from brain surgery. CDBG funding was used to bring electrical in the house to code, replace existing bathtub and tile backing in bathroom, make existing bathroom to meet ADA requirements, ceiling tile repair, new windows, guttering, repairing exterior wall, repairing back door, placing guardrail on back porch and installing landing at bottom of the outside steps (needed to meet code). Smoke detectors were also installed in the home. Home No. 3 is owned by an elderly widowed woman. Work included replacing windows, back door, roof to include guttering and painting fascia to keep it from rotting, install new HVAC (outside package unit), add insulation, and repair quarter round on bathroom ceiling. Home No. 4 is owned by a married couple with seven children. Work included

repairing bathrooms, floors and ceilings caused by leaks (leaks were also fixed), replacing hot water heater, replacing doors, replacing HVAC, installing new windows, repairing roof, adding insulation, and installing smoke alarms. Home No. 5 is owned by two disabled single sisters. CDBG funding was used to replace front entry door and storm door, demo shower floor and rebuild with new liner, replace subfloor and vinyl flooring which had become hazardous to walk on, install new shower door, new kitchen sink and faucet, install new oven (oven had not worked in years), install new sliding glass door, demo old deck and build new deck and steps (existing deck was unsafe), replace HVAC, demo meal shed in the yard (was about to fall down and not used), replace damaged fascia and soffit, repair garage door, demo existing sidewalk, build new sidewalk, make handicap accessible, and build door for crawl space.

Listed below are statistics on the homeowners who received rehabilitation assistance through CDBG during the 2012 Program Year:

Household Income	Head of Household	Size of Household	Handicap
\$11,914.00	Caucasian	4	No
\$20,046.00	Caucasian	2	Yes
\$ 8,300.00	Caucasian	1	Yes
\$43,930.00	Caucasian	9	No
\$34,580.88	Caucasian	2	Yes

### **Public Services \$49,575.91 – 11% of the Grant Funds Spent in 2012**

The Community Development Block Grant regulation allows up to 15% of the total grant amount to be used for public service projects.

#### **Transportation Assistance Services**

Goal:       Suitable Living Environment

Objective: Benefiting low and moderate income persons by improving and increasing access to services.

The objective of the City is to improve the mobility of our elderly and disabled income eligible citizens. All the participants are approved residents of the City of Rogers and although they do not all live in a low to moderate income area, their incomes do not exceed HUD guidelines. The City is able to accomplish this goal by offsetting the cost of the City approved transportation providers, Ozark Regional Transit, Northwest Arkansas Taxi, LLC, and Dynasty Taxi by providing the approved riders with coupons for free rides. The City has always opened this program to any provider of transportation that can provide the necessary insurance certificates and financial paperwork needed to be an approved system; however, only ORT, NWA Taxi and Dynasty Taxi have provided the paperwork needed to participate in the program. Identification cards are provided that must be shown each time the rider boards the bus or enters the taxi. Ozark Regional Transit, Northwest Arkansas Taxi, LLC and Dynasty Taxi provide the City a breakdown on each rider to include date picked up, where taken, and when returned home. An invoice is also provided with the breakdown each month. At this time, Ozark Regional is not charging the City to transport those on the CDBG program who use their means of transportation as the City subsidizes them each year. Because of some changes in bus stops, most of the Care riders can no longer use the bus. Transit logs provided help safeguard against



program abuse. This program has been invaluable to the City as most of the riders have no other means of transportation. A survey taken in 2010 reinforced the need for such a service. Over 95% of the clients agreed the service enabled them to have good quality of life and live in their homes knowing they could get to the places they needed to go without dependency on others. Forty three percent of those surveyed had no family living in Rogers. Of the 57% who did have family in Rogers, the family consisted of people who were unable to help due to economic and health issues. Some of the comments we received were:

"I can't imagine what I would have done without these services."

"This service has been a blessing to me."

"I am 96 years old and unable to drive. I don't go very much, but so thankful for this service."

"I don't own a car. This service helps me so much to get where I need to go."

"I don't have a car. I am very grateful I have this service to get to my cancer treatments."

"I am very impressed with this service. I retired here from Tallahassee, Florida. You have a very advanced, organized system for helping those with transportation assistance—heads up over Tallahassee. I have cancer and I don't know what I would do if I didn't have help getting me to my treatments."

"I really love this program. It really helps me. Even if I had a car, I wouldn't be able to afford gas and insurance."

"Thank you for sending me the vouchers each month. They are much needed."

"I had breast cancer in 1996 and again in 1999. I was diagnosed with colon cancer in 2010. This program is a blessing to me."

We are in the process of doing another survey and those comments will be reflected on our 2013 Capex.

The biggest complaint we have received has to do with the cost difference between Ozark Regional Transit and the taxi companies. Ozark Regional is a bus stop service while the taxis come directly to the home. There are many places in the City where Ozark Regional doesn't travel. Since the majority of the clients on this program are elderly, walking to a bus stop is not feasible and they are limited to where they can go using the bus system. Ozark Regional does operate a para-transit route which will come to a home; however, reservations for that must be made seven days in advance. For many of the elderly, that too is not feasible, as it eliminates their being able to see a doctor on a day's notice. Prices charged by the taxi companies are consistent with other taxi companies in Northwest Arkansas; however, their charges are higher than the bus system. Ozark Regional is aware of our need for more routes as well as one day service; however, they are operating on a very tight budget and in jeopardy of losing Federal funding due to the population of Northwest Arkansas exceeding 250,000 people. Unless additional monies become available, there will be no additional routes added. In fact, we could see all services eliminated in Benton County without additional funding. The CDBG office continues to monitor the needs of our clients. We are looking at increasing the number of coupons our clients receive at some point in the future to assist with their increased costs associated with not being able to use the bus system. The City will have to look at that cost very closely. With a 15% cap on service projects, we have to make sure we can continue to provide services for those already on the program and have room to add additional applicants as they are received. The City provided transportation assistance for 69 individuals during Program Year 2012.

### After School and Summer Programs

Goal: Suitable Living Environment

Objective: Benefit low and moderate income persons by improving and increasing access to services.

This program provided funding for an after school and summer care program for low income children. The program provides a safe and developmentally appropriate place for children. The goal of the program is to prevent antisocial behavior in children that will help children remain in school, provide character education, physical fitness, financial education, leadership and community service training. Field trips and special events are also planned providing opportunities that many of these children would never get to do. The after school and summer programs also enable the parents to maintain their employment and eliminate the costs of child care. During the spring semester of 2012, summer session of 2012, and fall semester of 2012, 261 people were impacted by this program.

### One Child, One Advocate

Goal: Suitable Living Environment

Objective: Benefit low and moderate income persons by improving and increasing access to services.

This program provides child advocacy to Rogers children who have been removed from their homes for various reasons and are not living in foster homes or children's shelters. This program ensures these children are safe, happy and receiving the appropriate medical, psychological, and educational services they need. CASA (Court Appointed Special Advocates) is dedicated to helping neglected and abused children, age birth to 18 as well as their parents. A total of 24 people were impacted by this program with 2012 funding from CDBG.

### Community Clinic

Goal: Suitable Living Environment

Objective: Benefit low and moderate income persons by improving and increasing access to services.

This program provides pediatric dental services to low income children in Rogers. These services include oral exams, sealants, fluoride treatment, restorative services, and extractions. By providing these services, Community Clinic hopes to break a family cycle of neglect and teach oral hygiene early enough to preserve a child's teeth for a lifetime. Funds were used to purchase consumable supplies and medications. A total of 1,484 children were impacted by this 2012 funding.

### Utility Reimbursement

Goal: Suitable Living Environment

Objective: Benefit low and moderate income persons by improving and increasing



access to services.

This program will assist with utility payments for extremely low to low-income residents of Rogers. Priority will be given to the elderly and homes where children reside. Fifteen people were impacted by this program in 2012.

**PUBLIC FACILITIES - \$272,428.68 – 58% of the Grant Fund Spent in 2012**

CDBG dollars were used to fund three public facility projects in 2012.

Ozark Guidance

Goal: Suitable Living Environment

Objective: Benefit low and moderate income persons by providing facilities to provide needed services for low to moderate income families and individuals.

This project provided funding for a retaining wall to be built at the Oak Tree Apartment complex, an eight unit apartment building that provides transitional housing for low-income adults with severe and persistent mental illness. Retaining wall is needed to stop erosion and assist with drainage problems in this area. Once the wall is built, the tenants will landscape and maintain the landscape which will be used as part of their therapy that will encourage interaction and community pride. The City also used some of the street drainage funds to lay some pipe in that area to move the water off the street. Eight individuals received benefit from the project at the apartment complex and numerous home owners in the area will enjoy the benefits of the water not running into the street anymore.

Open Avenues

Goal: Suitable Living Environment

Objective: Benefit low and moderate income persons by providing facilities to provide needed services for low to moderate income families and individuals.

Open Avenues serves over 100 adults living with emotional, mental and physical limitations. The Center operates a sheltered workshop where clients actively learn new skills, built close relationships, and provide business and industry with a reliable off-line production workforce. The Center has built a strong reputation of excellence and professionalism in the community and has partnered with local businesses and industry to provide timely, high-quality results. The goals of the Center are to foster independent living through the development of life, work, social skills, and prepare clients to become a part of, rather than apart from, the community. The Center also provides opportunities for a more fulfilling and productive life for those developmentally challenged individuals served by the Center and provides a big service to the parents of those disabled adult children. The Center moved into this new building in 2010. CDBG funding was used on infrastructure costs for the new facility. This was the last funding year for the new facility. This project impacted 115 mentally and physically challenged adults in 2012.

Street Improvements

Goal: Suitable Living Environment

Objective: Benefiting low and moderate persons by providing public improvements to low to moderate income areas.

This project was set up to continue building streets to City street standards in the low-income census tracts of Rogers, provide drainage in areas where needed and to place sidewalks and rebuild sidewalks to code in these low income areas. This year the City spent only a small portion of these funds to provide a drainage pipe to a low income apartment complex serving mentally challenged adults. Other projects using the carryover funds will start in 2013. The funds spent in 2012 impacted eight people with the drainage project and over 3,200 people on the Persimmon Street project.

**ADMINISTRATION \$51,827.28 – 11% of the Grant Funds Spent in 2012**

The Community Development Block Grant regulation allows up to 20% of the total grant amount to be used for administration cost. As stated above the amount spent on administration in 2012 was 11% of the grant funds spent and 13% of the 2012 grant allocation. Administration cost is the cost required to administer the CDBG Program including monitoring any sub-recipients. Administration funds were used to pay a portion of the CDBG Administrator's salary, travel for meetings and training the CDBG Administrator, as well as supplies and postage for the CDBG office. Funds were also used to reimburse the City for time spent by City employees who worked on design, inspections associated with CDBG projects other than housing, and providing support to the CDBG Program. Time sheets are kept on all employees whose salaries are impacted by CDBG funding.

**b. Provide a Breakdown of the CPD Formula Grant Funds Spent on Grant Activities for Each Goal and Objective.**

Listed below is the breakdown of the grant funds spent on grant activities for each national objective and City goal:

Project	Activity	Objective	Goal	Amount Spent
Housing	Rehabilitation Weatherization	Decent Housing	Benefit Low/Mod	\$90,965.50
Public Service	Transportation Assistance	Suitable Living Environment	Benefit Low/Mod	\$ 12,162.00
Public Service	After School and Summer Care	Suitable Living Environment	Benefit Low/Mod	\$ 26,320.00
Public Service	One Child, One Advocate	Suitable Living Environment	Benefit Low/Mod	\$ 5,000.00
Public Service	Community Clinic-Dental	Suitable Living Environment	Benefit Low/Mod	\$ 5,000.00
Public Service	Utility Reimbursement	Suitable Living Environment	Benefit Low/ Mod	\$ 1,093.91
Public Facility	Ozark Guidance	Suitable Living Environment	Benefit Low/Mod	\$ 3,650.00
Public Facility	Open Avenues	Suitable Living	Benefit	\$ 73,151.00

		Environment	Low/Mod	
Public Facility	Street Improvements	Suitable Living Environment	Benefit Low/Mod	\$195,627.68

The City spent a total of \$412,970.09 on projects in Program year 2012. By adding administration costs of \$51,827.28, the City of Rogers spent \$464,797.37 in Program Year 2012.

**c. If Applicable, Explain Why Progress was not Made Towards Meeting the Goal and Objectives.**

The City set their housing goal at six for 2012; however, we only completed five homes. We did receive the sixth application in 2011 but because of not being able to get into this house for inspection in a timely manner, this house will not receive rehabilitation work until 2013. Service projects were estimated to touch 2,925 people. We actually touched 1,853 people. Most of the reductions in estimated and actual had to do with the Community Clinic's figures supporting the CDBG grant. Had we included the families of these children, we would have been over our goals. Our facility projects were projected to impact 4,902 people and we actually showed an impact of 3,331 people. We did not complete one 2012 infrastructure project and had we been able to complete that, our numbers would have reached our goal. The Open Avenues numbers do not reflect the parents who have the burden of taking care of their adult children with development problems on a full time basis lifted somewhat by having a safe place they can bring their adult children to work, socialize, and become a part of the society in which they live.

**2. Describe the Manner in Which the Recipient Would Change its Program as a Result of its Experiences.**

The City did not see anything they would change in how the program operated. We were able to meet our timeliness standards in Program Year 2012. The City again received more requests for funding than allocated money. We felt we funded those projects that would have the biggest impact on the national objectives and goals of our City.

**3. Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing.**

The City entered into a contract with J-Quad & Associates in 2012 to provide a Fair Housing Study. This study was completed in 2012. The City provided HUD's Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity a copy of this most recent study. The City realizes fair housing and expanded opportunities are necessary for the City to meet its' housing objectives. The City understands the need for fair housing education and outreach and remains committed to providing fair housing services. In 2011 the City hosted along with the Arkansas Fair Housing Commission a town hall fair housing meeting.

**a.b. Provide a Summary of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice and Identify Actions Taken to Overcome Effects of Impediments Identified.**

**Banking, Finance, Insurance and Other Industry Related Impediments**

**1. Impacts of Increased Foreclosures, Rising Unemployment Rates, and the Sub-Prime Mortgage Lending Crises on Housing Choice, Affordability and Sustainability.**

Rising housing foreclosure rates and the impacts of the sub-prime mortgage crisis continue to negatively impact real estate and neighborhood stability and to decrease home values and sales prices throughout the country including Arkansas. The City of Rogers had 74 foreclosure filings as of May 2012; however, this is still way under the national average. The median housing value in the City of Rogers was \$156,000. The average home sales price in May 2012 was \$93,000, a 12.3% decrease from previous years. The rise in foreclosure rates may be related to both the rise in unemployment rates and the rise and fall of sub-prime lending markets. The unemployment rate for the City of Rogers was 6.7% in early 2012. From 2006 to 2010, Rogers averaged an unemployment rate of 5.8%. Sub-prime lending was also a factor with lenders offering loans to less creditworthy borrowers, borrowers that lack sufficient down-payments to afford the property, and risk based borrowers that speculate on the real estate market by acquiring real estate with no equity investment/down payment in hopes that the property will appreciate in value over a short period of time. These loans were generally offered at higher interest rates or through products involving adjustable interest rates and balloon payments. When the borrower cannot meet the increased mortgage payment, they default and the property goes into foreclosure. Although the City does not have any funds for reducing mortgage defaults and foreclosure rates, the City will continue using the CDBG Program to provide funding for home repairs and rehabilitation which will help reduce the mortgage default rate and foreclosure rates among low and moderate income home buyers and existing home owners.

**2. Low Number of Loan Applications for Minorities and Low Origination Rates for Minority Applicants.**

The removal of this impediment is not within the control of the local government. Finance industry policies, consumer credit worthiness, and economic trends all impact this issue. In visiting with local lending agencies and banks, one of the key components for the lack of minorities receiving housing loans comes down to the fact that many work for cash only and do not report their income. Therefore, they do not have the documentation necessary for providing proof of income. Many do not even have a checking account. Banks and lending institutions have implemented stricter restrictions on lending due to the foreclosure crisis this Nation has undergone. The City's only hope of impacting this impediment is for lending institutions to expand homebuyer outreach and education efforts in an effort to get qualified minorities interested in homeownership. We are seeing more credit counseling being offered at no cost to the participants.

**3. Predatory Lending and Other Industry Practices.**

This impediment was based upon perceptions by persons interviewed and those attending the focus group sessions. There are pay-day loans, check-cashing, and title-loan stores in Rogers, however, these are strictly monitored by the Arkansas Attorney General's Office. Focus group participants were concerned with extremely high interest rates being charged by not only neighborhood predatory lenders, but traditional banks and financial institutions for credit cards, auto loans, and other consumer loans. It should be noted that predatory lending is usually fueled by a poor credit rating, limited credit history, or lack of understanding of the borrowers as to alternative lending options. Again, this is nothing the local government can control other than report any business we feel is not operating under City of Rogers and State of Arkansas laws. It was suggested that the City encourage the area Chamber of Commerce or other local entities to consider establishing a consumer hot line for receiving complaints and concerns relative to industry practices. This information

will be passed along to the Rogers/Lowell Chamber of Commerce and the City will work with them in anyway they can to assist with this impediment.

### **Socio-Economic Impediments:**

1. **Poverty and Low-Income Among Minority Populations Impacting Fair Housing Choice.** The City supports agencies that provide workforce development programs and continuing education courses to low-income and minority residents. The City does feel that incomes that are reflected by the census numbers, particularly the Hispanic population, could show we have a lower income population than what the numbers suggest. Many of our Hispanic population may have three or more families living in that house with only one income; however, the count is only given as the number in the homeowner family. Employers of the City are encouraged to create training programs which target minority and low-income residents. The Chamber of Commerce with help from the City works hard to expand job opportunities in Rogers. The Rogers School District will open their first technical high school in August of 2013 which will provide young people not only the classes they need to attend college, but those students who desire to enter the work force upon graduation, technical type classes will be offered to equip these students with the skills they need to immediately enter the work force.

2. **High Poverty and Lower Incomes Among Minority Populations and Lack of Access to Healthy, Affordable Food Choices.** The Fair Housing Analysis spent most of the time on this analysis taking about how Shreveport, Louisiana is ensuring that all residents have reasonable access in close geographic proximity and are well informed about nutrition and grants this City has applied for to remedy this impediment. We feel this impediment was listed as more of an assumption that Rogers was like Shreveport without any data backing up this impediment. The City of Rogers does have a Farmer's Market which opens in April of each year and runs through the end of October. The market is located in historic downtown and is an excellent example of providing nutritional products at an economical price. The City has provided support to the Farmer's Market through Main Street Rogers. It was suggested that the City evaluate and consider applying for 2013 USDA Food Desert or other related grant funding that might be available. Rogers is presently involved in the Northwest Arkansas Livability Partners. Mrs. Johnston, the City's CDBG Administrator, sets on a Livability Steering Committee. One of that committee's focus is access to healthy, affordable food choices. This committee is looking at a region wide concept which will include all cities in Northwest Arkansas. Mrs. Johnston will continue to be a part of this committee in working to eradicate this impediment in the City of Rogers.

### **Neighborhood Conditions Related Impediments.**

1. **Limited Number of Affordable Housing Units and Resources to Assist Lower Income, Elderly, and Indigent Homeowners Maintain Their Homes and Stability in Neighborhoods.** While neighborhoods in the City of Rogers are relatively stable today and its housing stock is in fair to good condition, area conditions will decline if routine and preventive maintenance does not occur in a timely manner. The population is aging, which means more households with decreasing incomes to pay for basic needs. The City spends a portion of their CDBG funding for housing rehabilitation for the low income. It was suggested in the analysis that the City considers applying for a 2013 HUD Choice Neighborhood Planning Grant. The Livability Steering Committee is also pursuing applying for this

grant and the City will work within the umbrella of this agency as part of a regional approach. Rebuilding Together of Northwest Arkansas provides volunteer based initiatives aimed at improving housing conditions and neighborhood stability. They designate one weekend a year as "Rebuilding Day" and through donations and volunteers many homes are completely rehabilitated to make that home warm, safe, and dry. Several suggestions were given as a result of the analysis. Those suggestions are currently being evaluated to see what could be implemented through or with the assistance of the City of Rogers.

**Public Policy Related Impediments:**

1. **Increased Public Awareness of Fair Housing Rights and Local Fair Housing Legislation and Local Enforcement Should be Evaluated.** The City of Rogers has not enacted local Fair Housing Law so the analysis of applicable fair housing laws focused on the State of Arkansas Fair Housing Act. The City of Rogers is part of the enforcement geography afforded enforcement coverage by the Fort Worth Regional HUD FHEO Office. They received four fair housing complaints from January 2007 through December 2011. The City continues to support programs that educate the public about the right to equal housing opportunities and to plan partnership efforts with other organizations to help assure every American of their right to fair housing. In 2011, the City participated with the Arkansas Fair Housing Commission to host a fair housing town hall meeting and provided paid advertisements and provided local media announcements and coverage for this meeting.

4. **Describe Other Actions In Strategic Plan or Action Plan taken to Address Obstacles to Meeting Underserved Needs.**

The University of Arkansas, Fayetteville campus, conducted a Homeless Needs Assessment for the City in 2011. This assessment is a tool that can be used by the City to determine the best way to meet the underserved needs of the homeless. The CDBG Administrator assisted the University of Arkansas in a point in time head count conducted the last week of January 2013. The City continually strives to keep informed of the needs of its citizens. We have developed good relationships with the non-profits and organizations who serve the homeless, disabled, battered, and others put in positions that will not allow them to take care of themselves or their families. The City through their CDBG funding supports several programs that meet underserved needs. We are constantly looking for ways to improve the living environment of all our citizens.

5. **Leveraging Resources:**

a. **Identify Progress in Obtaining "Other Public and Private Resources to Address Needs.**

The City does not receive any other monies for their programs other than CDBG funds.

b. **How Federal Resources from HUD Leveraged Other Public and Private Resources.**

By partnering with non-profits, the City is able to leverage some of its funding to meet more needs. When land becomes available for Habitat Homes, the City is given



the opportunity to assist with the purchase of land. Past land purchases have enabled Habitat for Humanity to build seven homes in Habitat Trails. Lots are available to build eight more homes and these homes will be built when house sponsorships are available. Rehabilitation work and emergency repairs are provided individuals and families with income limitations that the City would not know about without our partnerships with Rebuilding Together of Northwest Arkansas and Office of Human Concern.

**c. How Matching Grants were Satisfied.**

None of the City's funds expended in 2012 were used for matching grants by other agencies.

The City of Rogers is appreciative of the Department of Housing and Urban Development's funding that provides the City the resources to carry out their housing, public service, and public facility programs. The City contributes to the CDBG Program by providing the CDBG Administrator office space, utilities, janitorial services, phone, and other items necessary to carry out the CDBG Program.

**Managing the Process**

1. Describe actions taken during the last year to ensure compliance with program and comprehensive planning requirements.

Program Year 5 CAPER Managing the Process response:

The City of Rogers has strived to successfully meet the goals of its Consolidated Plan and 2012 Action Plan. The CDBG entitlement funds are being expended in a timely manner. The City provided funds for five housing rehabilitations touching 18 lives. Five service projects were completed helping 1,853 persons have a suitable living environment by providing much needed services. Three public facility projects were completed that provided a suitable living environment for approximately 3,323 people. The City's street 2012 street project will get underway in 2013. There are 3,131 low income people living in this area. All of the CDBG supported projects respond to genuine and compelling needs of the City's neediest residents.

The Community Development Block Grant Office works with non-profits to provide services and suitable housing to the City's low income individuals. The City has worked with two non-profits to provide decent housing and three non-profits to provide a suitable living environment with needed services. The City also partnered with two non-profits to enhance public facilities that will provide services to low-income people as well as people with disabilities. The City is continuing to be involved with other Northwest Arkansas cities in addressing the emergency shelter needs as well as transitional/supportive housing to the homeless.

The City of Rogers' Planning and Transportation Department has a CDBG Administrator who is responsible for overseeing the CDBG Program and the development of the City's Annual Action Plan, CAPER, and Five-Year Consolidated Plan. The CDBG Administrator is responsible for administering the programs including their development, implementation, monitoring and reporting activities.

The CDBG Administrator works with the citizens of Rogers, community and neighborhood organizations, non-profit housing agencies, as well as the private



housing industry. The CDBG Administrator gathers data from citizens, meeting, and public hearings to encourage public comment and to use those views to establish priorities for housing and community development needs.

The CDBG Administrator communicates with several agencies in the development of the City's plans. Among those in 2012 were Habitat for Humanity, Rebuilding Together of Northwest Arkansas, Boys and Girls Club of Benton County (Rogers Unit), Ozark Regional Transit System, Northwest Arkansas Taxi, LLC, Dynasty Taxi, Open Avenues, Rogers Public School District, Office of Human Concern, Benton County Sunshine School, Court Appointed Special Advocates (CASA), Ozark Guidance, Seven Hills Homeless Shelter, Salvation Army, and St. Francis House, NWA., Inc., d/b/a Community Clinic at St. Francis House. The Administrator also visited with the Mayor and City Staff. Visits were also made with local news media, bankers, and realtors.

### **Citizen Participation**

1. Provide a summary of citizen comments.
2. In addition, the performance report provided to citizens must identify the Federal funds made available for furthering the objectives of the Consolidated Plan. For each formula grant program, the grantee shall identify the total amount of funds available (including estimated program income), the total amount of funds committed during the reporting period, the total amount expended during the reporting period, and the geographic distribution and location of expenditures. Jurisdictions are encouraged to include maps in describing the geographic distribution and location of investment (including areas of minority concentration). The geographic distribution and expenditure requirement may also be satisfied by specifying the census tracts where expenditures were concentrated.

\*Please note that Citizen Comments and Responses may be included as additional files within the CPMP Tool.

#### **Program Year 5 CAPER Citizen Participation response:**

The Consolidated Annual Performance Evaluation Report (CAPER) was made available to the public for review. The CAPER was placed on the City's website at [www.rogersarkansas.com](http://www.rogersarkansas.com) under City Administration, Community Development Grant Administrator on February 19, 2013. Hard copies were also placed at the following locations: City Hall, 301 West Chestnut; Rogers Public Library, 711 South Dixieland; the Adult Wellness Center, 2001 West Persimmon; and the Rogers Activity Center, 301 West Olive. A display ad was published in the City's local newspaper, Rogers Morning News, on February 19, 2013 advising that the CAPER was available for public review and comment. Comments on the CAPER were accepted for 15 days beginning February 20, 2013 and ending March 6, 2013. A copy of the display ad is located at the Affidavit of Publication section of this report.

#### **1. Provide a Summary of Citizen Comments.**

Any comments received during the 2012 Program Year will be made a part of the CAPER.

**2. Federal Funds Available for Furthering the Objectives.**

The CAPER identified Federal funds made available for furthering the objectives of the Consolidated Plan. For each formula grant program, the grantee shall identify the total amount of funds available, the total amount of funds committed during the reporting period, the total amount expended during the reporting period, and the geographic distribution and location of expenditures. Jurisdictions are encouraged to include maps in describing the geographic distribution and location of investment (including areas of minority concentration). The geographic distribution and expenditure requirement may also be satisfied by specifying census tracts where expenditures were concentrated. Tabs located at the back of the CAPER provide maps showing the geographic distribution and locations when the dollars were confined to specific areas. Census tract information is also provided for some of the activities.

Project	Funds Available	Funds Expended	Carry Over Funds
Rehabilitation Weatherization and Emergency Repairs	\$154,595.40	\$90,965.50	\$63,629.90
Transportation Assistance Program	22,000.00	12,162.00	9,838.00
After School and Summer Program	26,320.00	26,320.00	0.00
One Child, One Advocate	5,000.00	5,000.00	0.00
Community Clinic – Dental	5,000.00	5,000.00	0.00
Utility Reimbursement	5,000.00	1,093.91	3,906.09
Ozark Guidance	3,650.00	3,650.00	0.00
Open Avenues	73,151.00	73,151.00	0.00
Street Improvements	124,879.00	1,350.00	123,529.00
Persimmon Street Administration	194,277.68	194,277.68	0.00
	55,000.00	51,827.28	3,172.72 dropped in line of credit

There was one housing rehabilitation project that was started in late 2011 and was not completed until 2012. We had also anticipated six houses in lieu of five to be done in 2012 resulting in carryover funds into 2013. We had also been told that Ozark Regional Transit would start charging the City for those on our transportation assistance program that were using the bus route. At present the City, as well as other cities in Northwest Arkansas, supplements the funding for ORT. We felt most of the supplemental funding would go away in 2012 and we budgeted for increased cost for our transportation assistance program. This did not happen. Some routes, though, were discontinued in Rogers for 2012. At this point it is hard to determine what will happen with the ORT service. The citizens of Benton County voted down a tax that would increase funding for regional transportation. Washington County passed the tax. The result of the tax not being passed in Benton County is probably the reason routes are starting to get cut in the City. We will just have to wait and see what effect ORT Board decisions will have on providing routes that will

accompany the transportation needs of our citizens. There were also carryover funds for the utility reimbursement program. This was the result of less people needing utility assistance than we anticipated. Most of our assistance was used to pay water bills. There are several agencies that provide utility assistance and many of those we helped received assistance from them for gas and electric bills. Persimmon Street completed in 2012. The City did have some funding in 2012 to start sidewalk construction, provide drainage, and rebuild streets to City street standards in the low income areas of Rogers. We did not get started with this project as planned so most of those funds have been moved to 2013. The small amount we did spend was used to provide a drainage pipe at a low income apartment complex that serves mentally challenged adults.

## **Institutional Structure**

1. Describe actions taken during the last year to overcome gaps in institutional structures and enhance coordination.

Program Year 5 CAPER Institutional Structure response:

1. **Describe Actions Taken During the Last Year to Overcome Gaps in Institutional Structures and Enhance Coordination.**

The City of Rogers carried out the 2012 Action Plan through the use of Federal funds received from HUD. The Planning and Transportation Department through the City's Community Development Block Grant Coordinator and on behalf of the Mayor and City Council administers the CDBG Program. The Department works with several other municipal and non-profit agencies to successfully complete its CDBG-funded projects. The City Engineer, Project Engineer, and Street Department are involved in the development of plans and specifications as well as inspections for public facility improvement projects. The Building Inspections Department is involved in any housing rehab projects to ensure all work is done in compliance with City codes. Although the City has major strengths with an economy and unemployment that is better than most areas of the Nation, quality health care facilities, a public education system that has received national awards for its education programs, and a variety of local non-profits and social service agencies, the City does have gaps that affect quality of life for some of its citizens. One of these gaps is affordable home ownership opportunities. The City is continuing to work with housing developers and government agencies in the development of affordable housing. One new senior complex opened in late 2012. A portion of the units will designated for low income seniors.

## **Monitoring**

1. Describe how and the frequency with which you monitored your activities.
2. Describe the results of your monitoring including any improvements.
3. Self Evaluation
  - a. Describe the effect programs have in solving neighborhood and community problems.
  - b. Describe progress in meeting priority needs and specific objectives and help make community's vision of the future a reality.

- c. Describe how you provided decent housing and a suitable living environment and expanded economic opportunity principally for low and moderate-income persons.
- d. Indicate any activities falling behind schedule.
- e. Describe how activities and strategies made an impact on identified needs.
- f. Identify indicators that would best describe the results.
- g. Identify barriers that had a negative impact on fulfilling the strategies and overall vision.
- h. Identify whether major goals are on target and discuss reasons for those that are not on target.
- i. Identify any adjustments or improvements to strategies and activities that might meet your needs more effectively.

Program Year 5 CAPER Monitoring response:

**1. Describe How and the Frequency with Which Activities were Monitored.**

Monitoring is an ongoing process of reviewing the City's performance of meeting goals, ensuring compliance with regulatory and statutory requirements, and enhancing management capacity through technical assistance. It is the policy of the City to inspect all agencies that receive assistance under the CDBG Program on an annual basis to ensure compliance with applicable Federal, State and Local regulations. Monitoring procedures will vary depending on the type of project or activity undertaken. The policy is to ensure that the location receiving the assistance is in compliance with all conditions regarding the receipt of Federal funds. All projects and activities undertaken with CDBG funds will be consistent with the priorities and strategies in the Consolidated Plan.

**Housing** – All housing rehabilitation projects are monitored by the CDBG Administrator and the City's Building Inspections Department. Sometimes the City Engineer and/or Project Engineer will be made part of the monitoring team. Inspections are performed on any facility receiving CDBG funding until the completion of the project to ensure code compliances are met. On-site inspections are also completed prior to the start of any work. The City maintains copies of all appropriate paperwork required in any land acquisitions we might be involved in. There were no displacements of any individuals associated with home rehabilitation in Program Year 2012.

**Public Service** – Transportation Assistance project is monitored by the CDBG Administrator. Each application is reviewed to ensure all recipients meet the income guidelines for assistance. The City has three service providers for this program—Ozark Regional Transit, Northwest Arkansas Taxi, LLC, and Dynasty Taxi. All transportation providers furnish a breakdown on each rider with dates picked up, where taken, and when returned to pickup location or home. The breakdown is furnished with each invoice the City receives. Through out the monitoring system, the City has procedures in place to safeguard against program abuse. The Boys and Girls Club After School and Summer Program, CASA's One Child, One Advocate Program, and the Community Clinic are all monitored by the CDBG Administrator. The CDBG Administrator oversees the utility reimbursement program and reviews all applicants to make sure they meet the income guidelines for assistance. All checks written for these programs require two signatures to authorize check to be written--the CDBG Administrator and the Director of Planning and Transportation.

**Public Facility Projects** – The City’s infrastructure and drainage projects were monitored by the CDBG Administrator, Director of Planning and Transportation, Project Engineer, City Inspectors, and the City’s Street Superintendent. Anytime City personnel are used to provide labor and material on any facility project, the Street Department Superintendent provides the CDBG Administrator all material invoices and labor expenditures by City work forces. When contract forces are used, the City advertises for bids and all work is awarded using the competitive bidding process. A bid guarantee of five percent of bid is required for each bidder. Written contracts are written for all work performed. The accepted low bidder is required to furnish a performance and payment bond in the amount of 100% of the contract. All bid packets contain information on the prevailing wage rate schedule prescribed and mandated by Federal Labor Standards Provisions HUD-4010 and the most current General Decision Number. On-site monitoring is done by inspectors. On-site meetings are also held with the contractor, engineer, inspectors, Director of Planning and Transportation and/or City Project Engineer, and CDBG Administrator. Inspections and meetings are documented and made a part of the project file.

Three City employees--the Chief Financial Officer, the Director of Planning and Transportation, and the CDBG Administrator--are the overseers of the CDBG fund. The CDBG Administrator draws down the funds. The Director of Planning and Transportation approves the funds. The Chief Financial Officer writes the check. Receipt and disbursement of CDBG funds are a part of the City’s annual audit.

No files will be archived until inspected by the Arkansas HUD Office. Any citizen complaint will be addressed by the Mayor or CDBG Administrator within 30 days of receipt of the complaint.

## **2. Describe the Results of the Monitoring Including Any Improvements.**

Monitoring assures that Federal funds received by the City of Rogers complies with CDBG Program directives, and meets the objectives as set forth in the City’s Consolidated Plan. All agencies receiving funding entered into an agreement with the City of Rogers before funds were released. Monitoring also assures that work is done in accordance with plans and specifications and that all prevailing wage rates are met. Monitoring assures all safety requirements are met, and assures the City of no misuse or abuse of the City’s programs and funding.

## **3. Self-Evaluation.**

### **a. Describe Progress in Meeting Priority Needs and Specific Objectives and Help Make Community’s Vision of the Future a Reality.**

The drainage and street programs impact the citizens of Rogers immensely. There are areas in the City’s older neighborhoods where there is a lack of proper drainage. This can cause structural damage as well as creating a health hazard during mosquito breeding. The street work not only provides a better means of travel, but by adding curb and gutter to the streets, the City is helping prevent water accumulation. Sidewalks give our citizens a way to move from place to place cutting down on costs associated with transportation and providing exercise and impacting our citizen’s health. The City is also putting in handicap ramps at street intersections when placing sidewalks. The City had two designed infrastructure projects in 2012. We completed the street and sidewalk project on Persimmon Street and placed a

drainage pipe at an apartment complex that houses mentally challenged adults. The remainder of the 2012 project will begin in 2013.

Open Avenues provides a service to over 100 adults living with emotional, mental and physical limitations. The partnership between Open Avenues and business and industry enables this facility to be a reliable off-line production workforce for the community. These partners look to the Center time and time again for timely, high-quality results. The Center has built a strong reputation of excellence and professionalism in the community. They have fostered independent living through the development of life, work, and social skill that prepares clients to become a part of, rather than apart from the community, and provided opportunities for a more fulfilling and productive life.

The five service projects—Care Program (transportation assistance), After School and Summer Care, One Child, One Advocate, Community Clinic (dental), and Utility Reimbursement all provided assistance to the City's low income citizens. The Care Program greatly improved the mobility of income eligible seniors and disabled citizens. This is a priority for the City because this is the only means of transportation for many of our riders. The After School and Summer Care Program enabled parents to maintain their employment. Many of these parents could not afford to work as daycare would take all of their expendable income. One Child, One Advocate helped neglected and abused children be in a safe and happy environment and receive the appropriate medical, psychological, and educational services they need. The Community Clinic provides oral exams, sealants, fluoride treatment, restorative services and extractions for low income children. The Utility Reimbursement Program assists families with utility payments they can not pay due to circumstances beyond their control.

Housing projects provided rehabilitation to include weatherization and emergency repair. The City has ordinances that provide for affordable housing and have approved variances to assist in the building of affordable housing. The City has provided rehabilitation and emergency repair on five occupied and structurally sound homes in Rogers creating decent housing for 18 low income persons. It appears the rehabilitation of our older homes is still the most efficient method of preserving our affordable housing stock. This also prevents many of our at risk homeowners from becoming homeless because of living in substandard housing. Our goal is to restore houses where they are improved, preserved, and sound resulting in safe, secure, healthy, and energy efficient by bringing the dwellings up to current building codes and energy conservation codes. CDBG funds were used to update electrical, plumbing, and/or heating and air conditioning if necessary. Funds were also used to provide insulation, new doors and windows, roofs, repair water damage, replaced hot water heaters as well as making some homes handicap accessible. We had no emergency repairs in 2012.

The City spent considerable review time evaluating all proposed projects to prioritize needs and make sure all objectives and goals were met. Listed below are the percentage breakdowns of how CDBG monies were used in Program Year 2012:

Housing	20%
Public Services	11%
Public Facilities	58%
Administration	11%



c. **Describe How You Provided Decent Housing and a Suitable Living Environment and Expanded Economic Opportunity Principally for Low and Moderate-Income Persons.**

In 2012, the City did not provide economic opportunities for low and moderate-income persons with CDBG funds. As stated earlier, decent housing and a suitable living environment were accomplished by the number of houses that were renovated in the 2012 Program Year helping to preserve the City's affordable housing stock and approve the appearance of the older neighborhoods.

d. **Indicate any Activities Falling Behind Schedule.**

In Program Year 2012, we did fall behind schedule on one public facility project. Due to trying to complete the Persimmon Street project, we did not get our sidewalk project designed and ready to bid in 2012. We will definitely be under construction in 2013. We did spend a portion of our 2012 infrastructure project on a small drainage project. The City did not spend all their housing rehabilitation funds in 2012, but that was due to not receiving enough applications that qualified for the program. Those funds will be carried over into our 2013 Program. The only other project with carryover funds was transportation assistance. Again, we had budgeted based on being billed by Ozark Regional Transit and that did not happen in 2012.

e. **Describe How Activities and Strategies Made an Impact on Identified Needs.**

Housing projects have had a large impact on identified needs. Not only does this have an impact on the home and homeowner, but housing rehabilitation has an impact on the neighborhoods also. The owner takes great pride in the accomplishments of the rehabilitation. Some of the homeowners feel like they are living in a "new" home. Words can not describe the impact of the new Open Avenues building. You would have needed to be at the grand opening to see the faces of the disabled adults who work at this facility as they participated in the ribbon cutting officially opening their new facility. This facility will take care of a "special needs" group for a long time. Building streets to City street standards along with curb, gutter, and sidewalks enhances the overall appearance of the neighborhoods and provides those who use these streets with a safe avenue of travel. Our service projects have provided so many services to our low income people and given them opportunities to make a difference in the lives of their families.

f. **Identify Indicators that Would Best Describe the Results.**

Improved neighborhood appearance and home ownership pride can be seen from the five rehabilitation projects accomplished in 2012. One home contained two elderly sisters, both disabled, who could not even walk out on their deck because of the condition of the deck. One sister was in a wheelchair and the home was not even handicapped accessible making it very difficult to get her out of the house and to the doctor. One home contained a woman who had received a severe brain injury leaving her unable to function normally. One home had seven children in it and many of the faucets in the house did not work and only one tub was functioning enough to be used for baths. Open Avenues now has a facility where their clients can not only work in a comfortable and safe environment, but they now have the room to expand their services to the needs of the community. We saw an increase



in those who applied for transportation assistance from 2011 to 2012. Parents were given the opportunity to work without the load of childcare costs. Abused children taken from their homes were given safe havens where their needs could be met. Low income children were given dental treatment that would otherwise not be available to them. Families with utility shutoff notices were able to keep their utilities on to provide heat during the cold and to ensure they had water to drink and clean with. Streets in the City were upgraded to City street standards and one transitional housing complex for mentally challenged adults were given help to stop erosion and the adults were given an opportunity to use this for therapy to encourage interaction and community pride.

g. **Identify Barriers that had a Negative Impact on Fulfilling the Strategies and Overall Vision.**

As far as barriers the City sees with fulfilling strategies and overall visions, I would say getting people to apply for the program was our biggest barrier in 2012. We did not spend all our housing rehabilitation funds by the end of the year because of lack of applications. We are working hard to make people aware of the program. The barrier of contractors not willing to work small jobs has improved drastically from previous years; however, we are still finding many of those who provide the bids do not carry the necessary insurance and licenses needed to provide the work. Although, the City does not build houses with any of their grant money, affordable housing is still considered a barrier to fulfilling strategies and overall vision. Contractors in this area still put the larger homes as priority. We are seeing a few small homes built, but they are permitted by individuals contracting out a single-family dwelling built for them to live in. Some of the bank owned subdivisions are starting to build a few houses in those subdivisions, but most of them would not qualify as affordable housing. Another barrier would be the money the City receives. We have seen decreases in some years and in years where we have seen increased funding, the amount has not been at the \$487,000 entitlement amount the City received for many years prior to 2005. The cap at 15% on service projects hinders the City from providing additional funding to provide services to those in need. Most of our requests have to be reduced drastically and/or not funded to stay within our 15% cap. We make sure that applications we received have a direct impact on the citizens of Rogers.

h. **Identify Whether Major Goals are on Target and Discuss Reasons for Those that are not on Target.**

We feel that all major goals are on target. We are spending our funds as identified in our 2008-2012 Consolidated Plan.

i. **Identify Any Adjustments or Improvements to Strategies and Activities that Might Meet Your Needs More Effectively.**

The CDBG Administrator met with City Staff and non-profits and for-profit agencies. Public Hearings were held to gather input from the City's citizens. All of this information was used to assemble goals and objectives, performance measures and outcomes for the Five Year Consolidated Plan. All projects and activities undertaken with CDBG funds will be consistent with the priorities and strategies in the Consolidated Strategy and Plan. Projects will be monitored to ensure compliance with applicable Federal, State, and Local regulations. Draw-downs of CDBG funds

will be monitored and CDBG account reconciling will be accomplished several times during the Program Year.

## **Lead-based Paint**

1. Describe actions taken during the last year to evaluate and reduce lead-based paint hazards.

Program Year 5 CAPER Lead-based Paint response:

1. **Describe Actions Taken During the Last Year to Evaluate and Reduce Lead-Based Paint Hazards.**

According to the U.S. Census (2011 figures), there are 6,355 housing units built prior to 1978. It is estimated that approximately 30% of that total number could contain some levels of lead-based paint and are occupied by low-income individuals and families. Each home built before 1978 that is a part of the City's rehabilitation program will be tested for lead-based paint. All materials identified as containing high levels of lead-based paint will be removed and replaced if possible or feasible or it may be covered. All deteriorated lead-based paint identified in the risk assessment will be addressed during the rehabilitation of the dwelling. All construction material being removed from the home containing lead-based paint belongs to the contractor performing the work, and he/she is required to remove the material from the property. The dwelling is required to be tested if the work includes any demolition or major carpentry work and if the work involves painted surfaces. The results of the lead-based paint inspection will show where lead-based paint was detected and the concentration levels. The City must have possession of the lead-based paint inspection before work will proceed on the dwelling. Emergency work may be accomplished without having a lead-based paint inspection if the work will not affect the lead-based paint regulation such as roofing, exterior plumbing, some electrical, and/or HVAC. At the completion of a housing rehabilitation project, a lead based paint clearance inspection is done.

The City has implemented a lead-based paint policy. Two of the City's building inspectors have completed lead-based paint certification training. The CDBG Administrator, as well as the building inspectors who have attended lead-based training, will work with these agencies to assure lead-based paint rules and regulations are clearly identified and followed.

## **HOUSING**

### **Housing Needs**

\*Please also refer to the Housing Needs Table in the Needs.xls workbook.

1. Describe Actions taken during the last year to foster and maintain affordable housing.

Program Year 5 CAPER Housing Needs response:

1. **Describe Actions Taken During the Last Year to Foster and Maintain Affordable Housing.**

The City provided funds for the rehabilitation of five homes in Rogers in 2012. The City continues to work with Habitat for Humanity in looking for ways we can partner with them with CDBG funding through land acquisition and/or infrastructure needed to construct single-family, owner-occupied affordable housing.

### Specific Housing Objectives

1. Evaluate progress in meeting specific objective of providing affordable housing, including the number of extremely low-income, low-income, and moderate-income renter and owner households comparing actual accomplishments with proposed goals during the reporting period.
2. Evaluate progress in providing affordable housing that meets the Section 215 definition of affordable housing for rental and owner households comparing actual accomplishments with proposed goals during the reporting period.
3. Describe efforts to address "worst-case" housing needs and housing needs of persons with disabilities.

Program Year 5 CAPER Specific Housing Objectives response:

1. **Evaluate Progress in Meeting Specific Objectives of Providing Housing, Including the Number of Extremely Low-Income, Low-Income, Low-Income, and Moderate-Income Renter and Owner Households Comparing Actual Accomplishments with Proposed Goals During the Reporting Period.**

The CDBG Program's definition of affordable housing includes housing already owned and occupied by an individual or family whose total income, adjusted for family size, is 80% or less of the area median income. All of the homeowners assisted in 2012 had incomes below 80% of the area median, adjusted for family size. Three families were extremely low and two families were very low.

The City is aware of the need for more affordable housing and will continue to search for affordable lots to acquire for donation to Habitat for Humanity to be used for the construction of affordable homes. The City will also continue to assist with infrastructure costs, when needed, on lots to assist Habitat for Humanity in the development of new houses and affordable subdivisions. The City will also continue to work with developers interested in developing affordable housing areas. Rehabilitation of existing homes will continue. The rehabilitation projects will bring homes up to energy conservation standards, current plumbing, electrical, and HVAC codes. The City will continue to support non-profit agencies that provide programs to enhance the construction of new affordable housing as well as providing labor and material for existing homes. The City has ordinances and zoning codes that allow for affordable housing. The City's Comprehensive Growth Plan has several areas for affordable housing that have not been developed.

The charts listed below are based on the 2010 census.

Extremely Low	Low	Low-Moderate
2,161 (4%)	3,490 (6%)	2,409 (4%)

Owner-Occupied	Renter-Occupied	Vacant Housing Units
11,655	8,020	2,668

% of Income Costs for Owner Occupancy		% of Income Costs for Rental Occupancy	
Less than 20%	43.3	Less than 15%	27.2
20% to 25%	14.1	20% to 25%	12.5
25% to 30%	11.8	25% to 30%	10.2
30% to 35%	9.9	30% to 35%	9.3
Over 35%	20.9	Over 35%	39.1

In Program Year 2012, the City provided rehabilitation and repair work on five existing homes in Rogers. The City recognized that a gap does exist in affordable homeownership and is taking opportunities to work with developers to build affordable housing within the City limits of Rogers. Homeowner seminars by banks, lending agencies and realtors have been held within the City to educate the community about availability of funds for securing home loans; however, there seems to be less funding available for home purchases due to tougher restrictions qualifying individuals for loans.

2. **Evaluate Progress in Providing Affordable Housing that Meets the Section 215 Definition of Affordable Housing for Rental and Owner Household Comparing Actual Accomplishments with Proposed Goals During the Reporting Period.**

The City does not use CDBG funds on rental properties. The city was one short of its housing goals for housing rehabilitation due to lack of applicants. We proposed six and five were completed. Rehabilitation housing projects the City did in 2012 were handled directly by the City.

3. **Describe Efforts to Address "Worse-Care" Housing Needs and Housing Needs of Persons with Disabilities.**

Construction of affordable single family dwellings would be the worse case need in Rogers. The City's CDBG Program does not provide funding for the construction of affordable housing; however, the City's funds can be used for land acquisitions and infrastructure for new homes. The City's priority is keeping the affordable housing stock in good condition. The City does address the needs of disabled homeowners and has used funding for structural barriers and making homes handicapped accessible for the disabled.

## **Public Housing Strategy**

1. Describe actions taken during the last year to improve public housing and resident initiatives.

Program Year 5 CAPER Public Housing Strategy response:

1. **Describe Actions Taken During the Last Year to Improve Public Housing and Resident Initiatives.**

The City of Rogers did not participate in any kind of public housing with their 2012 CDBG funds.

## **Barriers to Affordable Housing**

1. Describe actions taken during the last year to eliminate barriers to affordable housing.

Program Year 5 CAPER Barriers to Affordable Housing response:

1. **Describe Actions Taken During the Last Year to Eliminate Barriers to Affordable Housing.**

The new construction approach is no longer hindered by the existence of a strong high-end market and lack of affordable builders in the residential market. The only high-end housing construction is the single home contracted by a single owner. Many of the builders in the area have left and/or have seen their businesses closed or filed bankruptcy because of financial conditions. Some of the builders who survived the downturn in the economy are building a few smaller homes as a way to continue residential housing construction. Some have even entered the remodeling business. As stated earlier, we are seeing banks holding deeds on undeveloped subdivisions starting to construct a few homes in those neighborhoods in hopes of recouping some of their losses associated with foreclosure. The City has implemented zoning ordinances which allow for affordable housing. Setback variances have also been granted to help the builder develop smaller parcels of land for building homes in the \$90,000 to \$120,000 range and yet still include amenities required by the City and still be profitable. It should be noted, though, that even that price range is still not affordable for some of the City's lower income families.

## **HOME/ American Dream Down Payment Initiative (ADDI)**

1. Assessment of Relationship of HOME Funds to Goals and Objectives
  - a. Evaluate progress made toward meeting goals for providing affordable housing using HOME funds, including the number and types of households served.
2. HOME Match Report
  - a. Use HOME Match Report HUD-40107-A to report on match contributions for the period covered by the Consolidated Plan program year.
3. HOME MBE and WBE Report
  - a. Use Part III of HUD Form 40107 to report contracts and subcontracts with Minority Business Enterprises (MBEs) and Women's Business Enterprises (WBEs).
4. Assessments
  - a. Detail results of on-site inspections of rental housing.
  - b. Describe the HOME jurisdiction's affirmative marketing actions.
  - c. Describe outreach to minority and women owned businesses.

Program Year 5 CAPER HOME/ADDI response:

The City of Rogers does not receive funds from Arkansas Department Finance Authority (ADFA) HOME Investment Partnership Program.

## HOMELESS

### Homeless Needs

\*Please also refer to the Homeless Needs Table in the Needs.xls workbook.

1. Identify actions taken to address needs of homeless persons.
2. Identify actions to help homeless persons make the transition to permanent housing and independent living.
3. Identify new Federal resources obtained from Homeless SuperNOFA.

Program Year 5 CAPER Homeless Needs response:

#### 1. **Identify Actions Taken to Address Needs of Homeless Persons.**

The City of Rogers continues their commitment to decent and affordable housing to address the homelessness situation and those at risk of becoming homeless. The City partnered with the University of Arkansas for a Homeless Needs Assessment in 2007 and a point in time count in Benton County (Rogers is located in Benton County) in January 2013. The CDBG Administrator was a part of the 2013 point in time count team. The City is also a member of the Northwest Arkansas Housing Coalition, a coalition of Northwest Arkansas cities and agencies who have teamed together to set a goal of eliminating homelessness.

#### 2. **Identify Actions to Help Homeless Persons Make the Transition to Permanent Housing and Independent Living.**

There are several organizations that exist in Northwest Arkansas that serve families or persons who are homeless or at a risk of becoming homeless. No funding was requested by those organizations in 2012. Although no actions were taken in 2012 too meet these transition needs, the Homeless Needs Assessment for the City has been a tool to enable the City to be better prepared to assist the homeless to make the transition to permanent housing and independent living. We have met with individuals who are interested in bringing transitional living facilities to our City to serve the needs of the homeless, however, that organization has not moved forward with this project. The City is committed to assist in anyway we can to meet homelessness needs. As stated previously, the CDBG Administrator for Rogers participated in the point in time count in January 2013.

#### 3. **Identify New Federal Resources Obtained from Homeless SuperNOFA.**

The City did not receive any funds from the Homeless SuperNOFA.

### Specific Homeless Prevention Elements

1. Identify actions taken to prevent homelessness.

Program Year 5 CAPER Specific Housing Prevention Elements response:

The cities of Springdale and Rogers contracted with the University of Arkansas' Fayetteville Campus to conduct a Homeless Needs Assessment to identify the size of the homeless population and determine what their needs are. The University provided the City of Rogers with a completed assessment in the summer of 2007. Since that time, every two years a point in time count has been done and that assessment revised as needed. The results of that assessment plus the point in time counts were considered in the preparation of the City's Five Year (2008-2012) Consolidated Plan and were used in the preparation of the City's 2012 Annual Plan.

### **Emergency Shelter Grants (ESG)**

1. Identify actions to address emergency shelter and transitional housing needs of homeless individuals and families (including significant subpopulations such as those living on the streets).
2. Assessment of Relationship of ESG Funds to Goals and Objectives
  - a. Evaluate progress made in using ESG funds to address homeless and homeless prevention needs, goals, and specific objectives established in the Consolidated Plan.
  - b. Detail how ESG projects are related to implementation of comprehensive homeless planning strategy, including the number and types of individuals and persons in households served with ESG funds.
3. Matching Resources
  - a. Provide specific sources and amounts of new funding used to meet match as required by 42 USC 11375(a)(1), including cash resources, grants, and staff salaries, as well as in-kind contributions such as the value of a building or lease, donated materials, or volunteer time.
4. State Method of Distribution
  - a. States must describe their method of distribution and how it rated and selected its local government agencies and private nonprofit organizations acting as subrecipients.
5. Activity and Beneficiary Data
  - a. Completion of attached Emergency Shelter Grant Program Performance Chart or other reports showing ESGP expenditures by type of activity. Also describe any problems in collecting, reporting, and evaluating the reliability of this information.
  - b. Homeless Discharge Coordination
    - i. As part of the government developing and implementing a homeless discharge coordination policy, ESG homeless prevention funds may be used to assist very-low income individuals and families at risk of becoming homeless after being released from publicly funded institutions such as health care facilities, foster care or other youth facilities, or corrections institutions or programs.
  - c. Explain how your government is instituting a homeless discharge coordination policy, and how ESG homeless prevention funds are being used in this effort.

Program Year 5 CAPER ESG response:



The City did not receive ESG funds from the Federal Government.

## COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

### Community Development

\*Please also refer to the Community Development Table in the Needs.xls workbook.

1. Assessment of Relationship of CDBG Funds to Goals and Objectives
  - a. Assess use of CDBG funds in relation to the priorities, needs, goals, and specific objectives in the Consolidated Plan, particularly the highest priority activities.
  - b. Evaluate progress made toward meeting goals for providing affordable housing using CDBG funds, including the number and types of households served.
  - c. Indicate the extent to which CDBG funds were used for activities that benefited extremely low-income, low-income, and moderate-income persons.
2. Changes in Program Objectives
  - a. Identify the nature of and the reasons for any changes in program objectives and how the jurisdiction would change its program as a result of its experiences.
3. Assessment of Efforts in Carrying Out Planned Actions
  - a. Indicate how grantee pursued all resources indicated in the Consolidated Plan.
  - b. Indicate how grantee provided certifications of consistency in a fair and impartial manner.
  - c. Indicate how grantee did not hinder Consolidated Plan implementation by action or willful inaction.
4. For Funds Not Used for National Objectives
  - a. Indicate how use of CDBG funds did not meet national objectives.
  - b. Indicate how did not comply with overall benefit certification.
5. Anti-displacement and Relocation – for activities that involve acquisition, rehabilitation or demolition of occupied real property
  - a. Describe steps actually taken to minimize the amount of displacement resulting from the CDBG-assisted activities.
  - b. Describe steps taken to identify households, businesses, farms or nonprofit organizations who occupied properties subject to the Uniform Relocation Act or Section 104(d) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended, and whether or not they were displaced, and the nature of their needs and preferences.
  - c. Describe steps taken to ensure the timely issuance of information notices to displaced households, businesses, farms, or nonprofit organizations.
6. Low/Mod Job Activities – for economic development activities undertaken where jobs were made available but not taken by low- or moderate-income persons
  - a. Describe actions taken by grantee and businesses to ensure first consideration was or will be given to low/mod persons.
  - b. List by job title of all the permanent jobs created/retained and those that were made available to low/mod persons.

- c. If any of jobs claimed as being available to low/mod persons require special skill, work experience, or education, provide a description of steps being taken or that will be taken to provide such skills, experience, or education.
- 7. Low/Mod Limited Clientele Activities – for activities not falling within one of the categories of presumed limited clientele low and moderate income benefit
  - a. Describe how the nature, location, or other information demonstrates the activities benefit a limited clientele at least 51% of whom are low- and moderate-income.
- 8. Program income received
  - a. Detail the amount of program income reported that was returned to each individual revolving fund, e.g., housing rehabilitation, economic development, or other type of revolving fund.
  - b. Detail the amount repaid on each float-funded activity.
  - c. Detail all other loan repayments broken down by the categories of housing rehabilitation, economic development, or other.
  - d. Detail the amount of income received from the sale of property by parcel.
- 9. Prior period adjustments – where reimbursement was made this reporting period for expenditures (made in previous reporting periods) that have been disallowed, provide the following information:
  - a. The activity name and number as shown in IDIS;
  - b. The program year(s) in which the expenditure(s) for the disallowed activity(ies) was reported;
  - c. The amount returned to line-of-credit or program account; and
  - d. Total amount to be reimbursed and the time period over which the reimbursement is to be made, if the reimbursement is made with multi-year payments.
- 10. Loans and other receivables
  - a. List the principal balance for each float-funded activity outstanding as of the end of the reporting period and the date(s) by which the funds are expected to be received.
  - b. List the total number of other loans outstanding and the principal balance owed as of the end of the reporting period.
  - c. List separately the total number of outstanding loans that are deferred or forgivable, the principal balance owed as of the end of the reporting period, and the terms of the deferral or forgiveness.
  - d. Detail the total number and amount of loans made with CDBG funds that have gone into default and for which the balance was forgiven or written off during the reporting period.
  - e. Provide a List of the parcels of property owned by the grantee or its subrecipients that have been acquired or improved using CDBG funds and that are available for sale as of the end of the reporting period.
- 11. Lump sum agreements
  - a. Provide the name of the financial institution.
  - b. Provide the date the funds were deposited.
  - c. Provide the date the use of funds commenced.
  - d. Provide the percentage of funds disbursed within 180 days of deposit in the institution.

12. Housing Rehabilitation – for each type of rehabilitation program for which projects/units were reported as completed during the program year
  - a. Identify the type of program and number of projects/units completed for each program.
  - b. Provide the total CDBG funds involved in the program.
  - c. Detail other public and private funds involved in the project.
13. Neighborhood Revitalization Strategies – for grantees that have HUD-approved neighborhood revitalization strategies
  - a. Describe progress against benchmarks for the program year. For grantees with Federally-designated EZs or ECs that received HUD approval for a neighborhood revitalization strategy, reports that are required as part of the EZ/EC process shall suffice for purposes of reporting progress.

Program Year 5 CAPER Community Development response:

1. **Assessment of Relationship of CDBG Funds to Goals and Objectives.**

- a.b.c. **Assess Use of CDBG Funds in Relation to the Priorities, Needs, Goals, and Specific Objectives in the Consolidated Plan, Particularly the Highest Priority Activities, Evaluation Progress Made Toward Meeting Goals for Providing Affordable Housing Using CDBG Funds, Including the Number and Types of Household Served, and Indicate the Extent to which CDBG Funds were Used for Activities that Benefited Extremely Low-Income, Low-Income, and Moderate-Income Persons.**

**Housing Objectives – 20% of Funds**

1. Objective 1, Housing Rehabilitation and Emergency Repairs. The City undertook five homes for rehabilitation or emergency repair. All of the individuals who received CDBG funding on their homes were considered low-income. A total of 18 individuals were helped by this program. The City used 100% of their 2012 housing dollars on this objective.

**Public Service Objectives – 11% of Funds**

1. Objective 1, Transportation Assistance. The City provided free rides in 2012 for 69 low income elderly and disabled citizens. The City used 25% of their 2012 public service dollars on this objective.

2. Objective 2, Boy's and Girl's Club of Benton County, Inc. (Rogers Unit). This project provided an after school and summer care program for low income children. A safe and developmentally appropriate place for these children provided character education, physical fitness, financial education, leadership and community services, training as well as field trips and special events allowing their parents to maintain their employment to provide basic needs for their families. This care program provided services to 261 children. The City spent 53% of their 2012 public service dollars on this objective.

3. Objective 3, One Child, One Advocate. This project provided volunteer advocacy to Rogers' children who had been removed from their homes for various reasons and were moved to foster homes or children's shelters. This program ensures these

children are safe, happy, and receiving the appropriate medical, psychological, and educational services they need. Children involved are from birth to 18. This program provided services to 24 individuals. The City spent 10% of their 2012 public service dollars on this objective.

4. Objective 4, Community Clinic-Dental. This project provided pediatric dental services to low income children in Rogers. These services include oral exams, sealants, fluoride treatment, restorative services and extractions which helps break a family cycle of neglect and teach oral hygiene early enough to preserve a child's teeth for a lifetime. CDBG funds were used to purchase consumable supplies and medications. This program provided services to 1,484 individuals. The City spent 10% of their 2012 public service dollars on this objective.

5. Objective 5, Utility Reimbursement. This project assisted with utility payments for extremely low to low-income residents of Rogers. This program provided services to 15 individuals. The City of Rogers spent 2% of their 2012 public service dollars on this objective.

#### **Public Facilities Objectives – 58% of Funds**

1. Objective 1, Ozark Guidance. This project provided funding for a retaining wall to be built at the Oak Tree Apartment Complex, an eight unit apartment building operated by Ozark Guidance that provides transitional housing for low-income adults with severe and persistent mental illness. Retaining wall is needed to stop erosion and assist with drainage problems in this area. Once the wall is built, the tenants will landscape and maintain as part of their therapy that will encourage interaction and community pride. This program provided services to eight individuals. The City spent 1% of their 2012 public facility dollars on this objective.

2. Objective 2, Open Avenues. This project completed the reimbursement of infrastructure costs to the new Open Avenue building. The center serves over 100 adults living with emotional, mental and physical limitations. They provide a sheltered workshop where clients actively learn new skills, build close relationships, and provide business and industry with a reliable off-line production workforce. This program proved service to 115 individuals. The City spent 27% of their 2012 public facility dollars on this objective.

3. Objective 3, Street Improvements. This project was set up to get streets where they meet City street standards and place curb and gutter, drainage and sidewalks in this area. We completed Persimmon Street with 2011 dollars in 2013 and did a drainage project near Oak Tree Apartments with 2012 funding. The remainder of 2012 funding will be spent in 2013. The work completed in 2012 provided new roads and drainage that impacted more than 3,200 people. The City spent 72% of their 2012 public facility dollars on this objective.

In the past the City has been able to assist Habitat for Humanity by providing funding to be used for infrastructure and/or land acquisition for building Habitat Homes to help meet the goals of new affordable housing in Rogers. This hasn't happened in the last few years due to no land becoming available or Habitat having a need for additional land. There hasn't been any Habitat houses built either that would have allowed the City to help with infrastructure costs. We will continue to partner with Habitat for Humanity in assisting in this endeavor to bring new affordable housing to Rogers. We did continue to provide home rehabilitation within

the City of Rogers helping the City to reach 83% of their goal with the five housing projects completed in 2012.

All monies used in 2012 were used on extremely low to low-moderate income families or individuals.

2. **Changes in Program Objectives.**

a. **Identify the Nature and the Reasons for Any Changes in Program Objectives and How the Jurisdiction Would Change its Program as a Result of this Experience.**

There were no changes in program objectives for the 2012 Program Year.

3. **Assessment of Efforts in Carrying Out Planned Actions.**

a. **Indicate How Grantee Pursued All Resources Indicated in the Consolidated Plan.**

The City pursued all resources indicated in the Consolidated Plan. We stayed in contact with Rebuilding Together of Northwest Arkansas and Office of Human Concern to meet housing needs. Those two agencies are a huge help in providing the city the names of individuals in desperate need of rehabilitation and repairs. The Plan also called for a partnership with Open Avenues to not only enhance public facilities but increase much needed services for the City's low-income families and individuals. The partnership with Ozark Guidance also allowed our funds to be used to assist adults with extreme mental illnesses. The city also partnered with Boys and Girls Club of Benton County (Rogers Unit), CASA, Community Clinic and local utility agencies to provide services that greatly impacted low-income children and adults who had immediate needs.

b. **Indicate How Grantee Provided Certifications of Consistency in a Fair and Impartial Manner.**

All agencies who applied for CDBG funding were evaluated by the CDBG Administrator, The City of Rogers' Planning and Transportation Director, and the Mayor. Each request was evaluated on amount requested and the number of people directly benefited by the funding. All home rehabilitations were evaluated by the CDBG Administrator and Building Inspections Department. The main concern of each evaluation was the needs of each home to be safe, warm, and dry. Homes were also evaluated on mortgage payments being current and made on a timely basis, the needs of the applicants, and the ownership of the home seeking assistance. We also checked to make sure that homeowners had not applied for assistance from Rebuilding Together of Northwest Arkansas or Office of Human Concern making sure that CDBG funding was not being used when other funding had already been committed to these projects.

c. **Indicate How Grantee did not Hinder Consolidated Plan Implementation by Action or Willful Inaction.**

The City followed its Consolidated Plan to the best of its abilities and within the funding allocation.

4. **Funds not Used for National Objectives.**

- a.b. **Indicate How Use of CDBG Funds did not Meet National Objectives and Indicate How They did not Comply with Overall Benefit Certification.**

All activities in the 2012 Program Year met at least one of the national objectives. All CDBG funds expensed in 2012 complied with the overall benefit. The City is committed to continuing to meet national objectives.

5. **Anti-Displacement and Relocation – for Activities that Involve Acquisition.**

- a.b.c. **Describe Steps Actually Taken to Minimize the Amount of Displacements Resulting from the CDBG-Assisted Activities, Describe Steps Taken to Identify Households, Businesses, Farms or Nonprofit Organizations Who Occupied Properties Subject to the Uniform Relocation Act of Section 104(d) of The Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as Amended, and Whether or Not They were Displaced, and the Nature of Their Needs and Preferences, and Describe Steps Taken to Ensure the Timely Issuance of Information Notices To Displaced Households, Businesses, Farms, or Nonprofit Organizations.**

No CDBG-funded activities involved the acquisition or demolition of occupied real property.

6. **Low/Mod Job Activities**

- a.b.c. **Describe Actions Taken by Grantee and Businesses to Ensure First Consideration was or will be Given to Low/Mod Persons. List by Job Title of all the Permanent Jobs Created/Retained And Those that were Made Available to Low/Mod Persons, and if any of Jobs Claimed as Being Available to Low/Mod Persons Require Special Skill, Work Experience, or Education. Provide a Description of Steps Being Taken or that will be Taken to Provide Such Skills, Experience, or Education.**

The City of Rogers did not undertake any economic development activities that directly resulted in quantifiable new jobs.

7. **Low/Mod Limited Clientele Activities.**

- a. **Describe How the Nature, Location, or Other Information Demonstrates the Activities that Benefit a Limited Clientele at Least 51% of Whom are Low-and-Moderate Income.**

To qualify for the City's Housing Programs, all applications must own and occupy a single family dwelling within the City limits and be extremely-low/moderate income based on HUD guidelines, adjusted for family size. Occupant's incomes are verified.

All applications who receive assistance through the City's Public Service Programs meet HUD's income guidelines, adjusted for family size. The City fosters good working relationships with our non-profit agencies that provide services to the low income individuals and families in our City.

All public facility projects were in low-income areas as determined by the U. S. Census Bureau or benefited low and moderate-income special populations.

8. **Program Income Received.**

The City of Rogers does not receive program income.

9. **Prior Period Adjustments.**

The City of Rogers did not make any prior period adjustments.

10. **Loans and Other Receivables.**

The City does not make loans or receive any income.

11. **Lump Sum Agreements.**

The City of Rogers did not have any lump sum agreements. The CDBG funds awarded to the City are drawn down monthly as needed.

12. **Housing Rehabilitation**

a.b. **Identify the Type of Program and Number of Projects/Units Completed for Each Program and Provide the Total CDBG Funds Involved in the Program.**

The City of Rogers did all their housing rehabilitation through the City. Five homes were rehabbed in 2012 at a total cost of \$90,965.50.

c. **Detail Other Public and Private Funds Involved in the Project.**

There were no public or private funds involved in any of the City's 2012 CDBG projects.

13. **Neighborhood Revitalization Strategies.**

The City of Rogers does not have a HUD-approved neighborhood revitalization strategy.

## **Antipoverty Strategy**

1. Describe actions taken during the last year to reduce the number of persons living below the poverty level.

Program Year 5 CAPER Antipoverty Strategy response:

1. **Describe**



The 2010 U. S. Census determined that 14.4% of Rogers' residents lived in poverty. Many of these were families with female householder and with children under the age of five. The next largest group was female householder with children under 18 years of age. Seniors made up the smallest group of people. The City recognizes that in order to reduce the number of households earning income below the poverty level, we not only need educated and trained people, but we must have the positions available in our work force. Millions of dollars have been spent and are continuing to be spent on the City's infrastructure in past years to attract development. Many new jobs were created by the development during the construction phases and hiring of employees as retail and restaurants opened. We saw a tremendous and are still seeing growth of medical facilities in Rogers. The City passed a bond issue in 2011 which will provide additional funding to put infrastructure in place to continue development in our City. Also with that bond passage the City will see new parks built and existing parks updated. A new sports park complex opened in January of 2013 and the City already has numerous tournaments booked for this facility. A new aquatic center will open in May of 2013. Rogers has a stable Government and an excellent health care and school system. We are home to a brand new Hospital and Medical Park and a state of the art cancer treatment facility. Construction will begin in 2013 on another large medical center complex in the City. Many of the schools in Rogers are nationally recognized and beginning in the 2013-2014 school year, Rogers will offer a new technology high school. Enrollment has already started. New businesses have opened in and around the Pinnacle Hills Promenade, a lifestyle retail/restaurant center. Cabela's opened in summer of 2012. Rogers did not see a sales tax month below \$1M in 2012. Our neighboring City, Bentonville, has a world class museum, Crystal Bridges. Rogers is benefiting greatly from those who travel to see this museum and stay, eat, and shop in our City. Over 250,000 visitors visited the museum in its first year of operation. The City works with local businesses to stimulate business and economic development in impoverished areas of the City as much of the City's industrial area lies in low income census tracts. The City will start construction of new roads in some of the lowest income sections in Rogers. These roads will be built to City street standards with curb and gutter and sidewalks. Unsafe curves will be taken out and the new road will be a boulevard design with landscaped median. The appearance of this area will be greatly enhanced and with the new roads, we feel more businesses will start up in this area for an economic boost to the citizens in this area. The local Chamber of Commerce works hard to bring economic development to our City.

## NON-HOMELESS SPECIAL NEEDS

### Non-homeless Special Needs

\*Please also refer to the Non-homeless Special Needs Table in the Needs.xls workbook.

1. Identify actions taken to address special needs of persons that are not homeless but require supportive housing, (including persons with HIV/AIDS and their families).

Program Year 5 CAPER Non-homeless Special Needs response:

1. **Identify Actions Taken to Address Special Needs of Persons that are not Homeless but Require Supportive Housing.**

The 2010 U. S. Census counted 3,527 non-elderly people with a disability and 2,129 elderly people with a disability living in the City of Rogers. Most of these disabilities are physical. There was no breakdown in the 2010 census on disability employment or disability in relation to the poverty level when the 2012 Caper was written. Fifty percent of those with a disability were employed and 24% of those suffering from disability were living below the poverty level based on 2000 census figures. There was one action taken during 2012 to address special needs of persons who require supportive housing. This was the project at Ozark Guidance. Although the project provided a retaining wall to help with a drainage problem, Ozark Guidance will purchase landscaping and use the occupants of this supportive housing to do the work and maintain the landscaping as a form of therapy. There are several organizations existing that serve families or individuals with special needs who require supportive housing. These organizations provide a wide range of services. The City will continue to provide these agencies with applications for the City's CDBG funding.

### **Specific HOPWA Objectives**

\*Please also refer to the HOPWA Table in the Needs.xls workbook.

1. Overall Assessment of Relationship of HOPWA Funds to Goals and Objectives  
Grantees should demonstrate through the CAPER and related IDIS reports the progress they are making at accomplishing identified goals and objectives with HOPWA funding. Grantees should demonstrate:
  - a. That progress is being made toward meeting the HOPWA goal for providing affordable housing using HOPWA funds and other resources for persons with HIV/AIDS and their families through a comprehensive community plan;
  - b. That community-wide HIV/AIDS housing strategies are meeting HUD's national goal of increasing the availability of decent, safe, and affordable housing for low-income persons living with HIV/AIDS;
  - c. That community partnerships between State and local governments and community-based non-profits are creating models and innovative strategies to serve the housing and related supportive service needs of persons living with HIV/AIDS and their families;
  - d. That through community-wide strategies Federal, State, local, and other resources are matched with HOPWA funding to create comprehensive housing strategies;
  - e. That community strategies produce and support actual units of housing for persons living with HIV/AIDS; and finally,
  - f. That community strategies identify and supply related supportive services in conjunction with housing to ensure the needs of persons living with HIV/AIDS and their families are met.
2. This should be accomplished by providing an executive summary (1-5 pages) that includes:
  - a. Grantee Narrative
    - i. Grantee and Community Overview
      - (1) A brief description of your organization, the area of service, the name of each project sponsor and a broad overview of the range/type of housing activities and related services
      - (2) How grant management oversight of project sponsor activities is conducted and how project sponsors are selected

- (3) A description of the local jurisdiction, its need, and the estimated number of persons living with HIV/AIDS
  - (4) A brief description of the planning and public consultations involved in the use of HOPWA funds including reference to any appropriate planning document or advisory body
  - (5) What other resources were used in conjunction with HOPWA funded activities, including cash resources and in-kind contributions, such as the value of services or materials provided by volunteers or by other individuals or organizations
  - (6) Collaborative efforts with related programs including coordination and planning with clients, advocates, Ryan White CARE Act planning bodies, AIDS Drug Assistance Programs, homeless assistance programs, or other efforts that assist persons living with HIV/AIDS and their families.
- ii. Project Accomplishment Overview
  - (1) A brief summary of all housing activities broken down by three types: emergency or short-term rent, mortgage or utility payments to prevent homelessness; rental assistance; facility based housing, including development cost, operating cost for those facilities and community residences
  - (2) The number of units of housing which have been created through acquisition, rehabilitation, or new construction since 1993 with any HOPWA funds
  - (3) A brief description of any unique supportive service or other service delivery models or efforts
  - (4) Any other accomplishments recognized in your community due to the use of HOPWA funds, including any projects in developmental stages that are not operational.
- iii. Barriers or Trends Overview
  - (1) Describe any barriers encountered, actions in response to barriers, and recommendations for program improvement
  - (2) Trends you expect your community to face in meeting the needs of persons with HIV/AIDS, and
  - (3) Any other information you feel may be important as you look at providing services to persons with HIV/AIDS in the next 5-10 years
- b. Accomplishment Data
  - i. Completion of CAPER Performance Chart 1 of Actual Performance in the provision of housing (Table II-1 to be submitted with CAPER).
  - ii. Completion of CAPER Performance Chart 2 of Comparison to Planned Housing Actions (Table II-2 to be submitted with CAPER).

Program Year 5 CAPER Specific HOPWA Objectives response:

The City of Rogers does not receive HOPWA funds from the Federal Government.

## OTHER NARRATIVE

Include any CAPER information that was not covered by narratives in any other section.

Program Year 5 CAPER Other Narrative response:

The 2012 Program Year for the City of Rogers was successful. All program areas were met or exceeded the goals and objectives laid out in the 2008-2012 Consolidated Plan and the 2012 Action Plan. City Staff, City Council and our non-profit organizations worked hard to meet the needs of the City's low-and-moderate income residents.